

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 2 is canceled by this amendment. Thus, Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 5, 9, 15 and 16 being independent.

The Examiner is thanked for withdrawing the prior art rejections of Claims 1-4 and 9-16 set forth in the previous Official Action.

Presently, Claims 1-16 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 9, 15 and 16 are allegedly indefinite for including the language "an original form", and Claim 5 is allegedly indefinite for reciting "a first portion" and "a second portion".

It is respectfully submitted that the language "image data in an original form" that is included in Claims 1, 9, 15 and 16 is not indefinite at least because --original image data-- is clearly described in the specification. In the Background of the Invention section it is explained that when printing image data originally created/saved within a digital camera, one may want to print the image data to paper and save the image data to a CD-ROM. Also, the user may want to correct/enhance the image data originally saved in the camera before printing to the paper. Thus, a question arises regarding which image data should be saved on the CD-ROM, the corrected image data or the image data that was originally saved in the camera? According to the present invention, the image data originally saved in the camera is saved on the CD-ROM. Otherwise, if the corrected image data was saved in the CD-ROM, once the camera memory is erased the original image data would be lost forever. By saving the original image data saved in the camera on a CD-ROM,

image correction can be repeatedly performed on the original image data. These issues are specifically described in the Detailed Description section on page 14, lines 1-9 of the present specification, where it is stated that (emphasis added) “[a]fter the data is input from the recording medium (S801), the original image data is saved in the memory (S802), so that the original image data may be preserved until the operation is completed and may be accessed at all times. During saving of the image data, this data is directly saved in the storage medium. Because the image to be saved on the medium is raw data (original image data), prints of the same quality may be provided if the storage medium is used for the next session of printing.” Thus, the inclusion of the claim language referring to --original image data-- is definite.

However, to better address the concerns set forth in the Official Action, Claims 1, 5, 9, 15 and 16 are amended to generally define that the image data is received from a first image recording medium in an original form in which the image data is recorded in the first image recording medium. It is believed that this amendment specifically addresses the concerns raised in the Official Action.

With respect to Claim 5, it is respectfully submitted that the language “a first portion” and “a second portion” is not indefinite because there are numerous portions of the present specification that describe a first part into which a first medium in which image data is stored is set and a second portion into which a second medium into which image data is to be saved is set. For example, attention is directed to the paragraph abridging pages 9 and 10 of the present specification referring to drives 10, 11, 12 and 13. Each of the drives 10, 11, 12, 13 is a part into which a medium in

which image data can be stored/saved can be set. Therefore, the inclusion of the language directed to "a first portion" and "a second portion" is definite.

However, in an attempt to address the concerns raised in the Official Action, Claim 5 is amended to recite --a first portion for setting a medium-- and --a second portion for setting a medium--. It is believed that this amendment specifically addressed the issues raised in the Official Action.

For the reason stated above, it is requested that the rejections be withdrawn and that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application; the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned counsel for Applicants regarding the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 2, 2005

By: Kevin B. McCall (Rn. 53,297)
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620